



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/998,095

11/30/2001

Darryl Lee Presley

50277-1961

4337

42425

7590

08/24/2006

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER/ORACLE
2055 GATEWAY PLACE
SUITE 550
SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1089

EXAMINER

VU, THONG H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/998,095

Applicant(s)

PRESLEY, DARRYL LEE

Examiner

Thong H. Vu

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 7-111 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-111, 14-37, 39-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. Claims 1-5,7-11,14-37, and 39-49 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5,7-11,14-37, and 39-49 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5,7-11,14-37,39-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Synnestvedt et al [Synnestvedt, 6,598,057 B1].

3. As per claim 1, Synnestvedt discloses A system for actively managing configurable components [Synnestvedt, generating configuration files using policy description, abstract], comprising:

a plurality of components, each component storing a configuration comprising a set of configuration parameters [Synnestvedt, cable modem, col 4 lines 52; configuration parameters, col 7 lines 22-40];

a repository (i.e.: database) that stores information about a configuration policy [Synnestvedt, database, col 6 lines 40-63];

a server [Synnestvedt, a TFTP server 124, Fig 1] configured to

register each of the plurality of components [Synnestvedt, registration process, col 10 lines 10-23],

perform dynamic probing operations to identify configuration changes made to the configuration of each of the plurality of components [Synnestvedt, dynamically generating configuration files, col 3 lines 40-53] and

validate identified configuration change against the configuration policy to determine whether the configuration changes conform to the configuration policy [Synnestvedt, configuration validity, col 4 line 7; validate the format, line 62; and the generated configuration file should conform to, col 6 lines 25-35].

4. As per claim 2, Synnestvedt discloses the configuration policy defines for each confirmation parameter of the configuration of each of the plurality of components a value range for which the configuration parameter will be successfully validated by the server [Synnestvedt, parameter, col 4 line 56-col 5 line 10, Fig 3].

5. As per claim 3, Synnestvedt discloses responding to an identified confirmation change by performing at least one of:

changing a value of at least one configuration parameter to a default or previously validated value [Synnestvedt, change or modified configuration file, col 18 lines 33-45; col 19 lines 1-36, Fig 5];

auditing configuration parameters of the confirmation of at least one of the plurality of components [Synnestvedt, change configuration, Fig 5, col 19 lines 1-36];

generating an alert regarding the confirmation parameters of the confirmation of at least one of the plurality of components [Synnestvedt, log error and warning, col 5 lines 35-65];

acquiescing to the identified configuration change [Synnestvedt, the generated configuration file should conform to, col 6 lines 25-35; configuration change, col 19 lines 1-36].

6. As per claim 4, Synnestvedt discloses logging data that identifies an identified configuration change made to the configuration of the particular component to a log file [Synnestvedt, message log, col 5 lines 35-65].

7. As per claim 5, Synnestvedt discloses performing an impact analysis on the identified configuration changes against the plurality of components [Synnestvedt, calculated the configuration setting, col 16 lines 7-55].

8. As per claim 39, Synnestvedt discloses the information indicates a relationship dependency between a first configuration parameter in the configuration of a first component and a second configuration parameter in the configuration of a different component [Synnestvedt, change configuration, Fig 5, col 19 lines 1-36].

9. As per claim 40, Synnestvedt discloses the server validates the configuration, for the first component based upon the relationship dependency between the first

configuration parameter and the second configuration parameter [Synnestvedt, change configuration, Fig 5, col 19 lines 1-36].

10. As per claim 41, Synnestvedt discloses the information includes at least one document type definition defining a mapping between the configuration of at least two of the plurality of individual components [Synnestvedt, string match, col 5 lines 35-65].

11. As per claim 47, Synnestvedt discloses the relationship dependency comprises one of one-way, two-way, cyclic, one-to-many, many-to-one, and many-to-many as a design choice.

12. Claims 7-11,42-46 and 48 contain the identical limitations set forth in claims 1-5,39-41 and 47. Thus, claims 7-11,42-46 and 48 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claims 1-5,39-41 and 47.

13. As per claim 14, Synnestvedt discloses A system, comprising:

a plurality of components wherein each component of the plurality of components comprises a client module for accessing configuration parameters of a configuration of the component [Synnestvedt, configuration files and parameters, col 4 lines 56-col 5 line 10];

a management server which maintains a repository for storing information about a configuration policy [Synnestvedt, a TFTP server, col 3 lines 54-col 4 line 8];

a management console capable of accessing the repository wherein the management console comprises [Synnestvedt, LDAP server and database, col 6 lines 40-62]:

at least one service interface for retrieving the configuration of a particular component of the plurality of components by communicating with the client module associated with the particular component [Synnestvedt, retrieve network configuration information, col 1 lines 58-64];

a parser for extracting configuration parameters from each retrieved [Synnestvedt, the parser, col 5 lines 59];

a validator for validating each extracted configuration parameter against the configuration policy [Synnestvedt, LDAP search filter, col 6 lines 40-48].

14. As per claim 15 Synnestvedt discloses at least one adapter for accessing component-specific configuration parameters of the configuration of at least one of the plurality of components [Synnestvedt, extract the cable modem's vendor prefix based on configuration policy, col 8 lines 35-52].

15. As per claim 16, Synnestvedt discloses at least one component-specific adapter for dynamically probing the plurality of components [Synnestvedt, dynamically generating configuration files, col 3 lines 40-52].

16. As per claim 17, Synnestvedt discloses a component parameter relationship dependency tree formed from the extracted configuration parameters; and an impact analyzer for analyzing the effect of making a configuration change to the configuration of a particular component of the plurality of components by traversing the component parameter relationship dependency tree [Synnestvedt, extract the cable modem's vendor prefix based on configuration policy, col 8 lines 35-52].

17. As per claim 18, Synnestvedt discloses a change manager for effecting a change to a configuration parameter [Synnestvedt, updating configuration files, col 2 lines 35-45].

18. As per claim 19, Synnestvedt discloses a set of one or more XML documents comprising the extracted configuration parameters as inherent feature of middleware.

19. As per claim 20, Synnestvedt discloses the configuration policy is expressed in a set of global (i.e.: internet) parameter definitions and document type definitions [Synnestvedt, Internet 108, Fig 1].

20. As per claim 21 Synnestvedt discloses validation services, wherein the validation services perform at least one of: managing the configuration parameters of the configuration of the plurality of components ; advising an administrator about the configuration parameters of the confirmation of the plurality of components ;

alerting an administrator about the configuration parameters of the confirmation of the plurality of components ; and acquiescing to the modification of the configuration parameters of the confirmation of the plurality of components [see rejection claim 3].

21. As per claim 22, Synnestvedt discloses a browsing service providing a user interface management console as inherent feature of Internet.

22. As per claim 23, Synnestvedt discloses a management configuration module for registering new components [Synnestvedt, new services, col 3 lines 40-53].

23. As per claim 24 Synnestvedt discloses a management configuration module capable of receiving XML documents which describe the configuration parameters of the configuration of a particular component, when the configuration of the particular component is changed as a design choice of middleware over Internet.

24. As per claim 25, Synnestvedt discloses at least one of the plurality of components corresponds to at least one of a Web server, an Internet application server and a database server [Synnestvedt, Internet 108, Fig 1].

25. Claims 26-37 contain the identical limitations set forth in claims 14-25. Thus, claims 26-37 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claims 14-25.

Art Unit: 2142

26. As per claim 49, Synnestvedt discloses A computer-readable storage medium holding code which, when executed, performs the method according to any one of claims 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, and 48 [Synnestvedt, a local configuration database, col 6 lines 40-62].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5,7-11,14-37,39-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jager [6,892,231 B2].

27. As per claim 14, Jager discloses A system, comprising:

a plurality of components wherein each component of the plurality of components comprises a client module for accessing configuration parameters of a configuration of the component [Jager, components, col 4 lines 52; configuration parameter, col 7 lines 22-40];

a management server which maintains a repository for storing information about a configuration policy [Jager, web server with rules and configuration parameter, col 8 lines 42-55];

a management console capable of accessing the repository wherein the management console comprises:

at least one service interface for retrieving the configuration of a particular component of the plurality of components by communicating with the client module associated with the particular component [Jager, web browser, col 5 lines 22-34];

a parser for extracting configuration parameters from each retrieved [Jager, web server parse configuration file, col 9 lines 1-20];

a validator for validating each extracted configuration parameter against the configuration policy [Jager, the setting file is valid, col 9 lines 1-20].

Claims 1-5,7-11,13-37,39-49 contain the identical limitations set forth in claim 14. Thus, claims 1-5,7-11,13-37,39-49 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claim 14.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner *Thong Vu*, whose telephone number is (571)-272-3904. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:00AM- 3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Andrew Caldwell*, can be reached at (571) 272-3868. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval IPAIRI system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PMR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thong Vu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2142

